

\wricon

& ~~auto.~~wriconf.1a

13 December 1988

After Princeton: April 1968

(earlier: started psychoanalysis)
riots over MLK death, Washington burning.

Work for RFK.; but not full time in office (Forrestal)

Columbia sit-in

Seminar at Harvard, HAK; talk to HAK about Rockefeller

Talk to Gavin's man, Romney's man

Humphrey luncheon (Huntington, Brzezinski) (comments on Columbia
sit-in, which Hayden had attended)

No More Vietnams? Humphrey and me; Chicago Conference;
RFK killed. (Susan Bellow)

On Kupcinet Show: denunciation of bombing (see PoW)

.RFK funeral: acid

Chicago riots; acid. (LBJ can't come; Humphrey nominated; McC
passive)

Humphrey can't call for stopping bombing (what if war isn't over:
what if DRV attacks?)

invasion of Czechoslovakia; Paris, Mexico uprisings.

N claims secret plan to end the war.

I swing.

Review of HK: Can we win in VN?

My exchange with Gass: starting with my explanation--thanks to
Vann--of why NLF hadn't won by mid-68 (why war wasn't over: as
Sheehan thinks, still--and perhaps Berman does, too--, and Vann
was denying)

I'm reading King, Gandhi, Sharp, bondurant: while nonviolent
resistance in Prague.

LBJ stops bombing; I stop swinging and take an interest in
election.

Thieu refuses to come to Paris; N wins.
(October surprise: or lack of it. Thanks to Allen...and Vann?)

HAK seminar at RAND: I learned more from DE in Vn...

HAK asks for options study; I work with Gelb and MHH, Cook...

Christmas Day; take options to Hotel Pierre.

Day after Christmas: breakfast with HAK, suggest Questions (NSSM-1); discussion of options with HAK and Schelling. Rewrite (add threats; not, win strategy)

1969

Spring: everyone thought war was over.
(see auto\Ohio.69)

Work on NSSM-1 while Ikle redrafts final version: leaves out Extrication (Goodpaster). A to Z": but not nuclears.

NSSM-summary, with Winston Lord. Propose new NSSMs (rejected).

Work on D's, from my notes: I to IX, on VNese politics, based partly on talks with Vu Van Thai (who had said during Tet, "no more lesser evils!) and Hoang Van Chi; and on "Could we have won in Vietnam? When was it too late?"

Word from MHH: first proposal was my favorite, mutual withdrawal (at first NSC meeting, January). "FOR THE FIRST TIME, I'm SATISFIED WITH OUR VIETNAM POLICY."

Quiet on campuses (see comments on Ohio class)

Ohio class: "Do we have the right?"

May? Pat comes out (having consulted me on acid in December?); we go to Point Lobos; then to Malibu, Elysium...

HAK proposal of WH consultantship. But I don't want to staff war, only to press for withdrawal (see my initial ambivalence about options study; don't answer

(reading Noam Chomsky?) meet?

On recommendation of Adam Walinsky, Sam Brown invites me to join staffing of Moratorium: I decline, wait to see if it looks significant.

Vann says Chau in trouble; urges me to come out. I apply; vetoes by Jacobson, Colby.

instead, I go to WRI Triennial.

WRI Triennial, August 25-31, 1969

Let's say: I saw MHH just before conference (either that or Friday, after conference; I think it must have been before; so I had PP? Unless I picked it up on Friday at RAND, to come back. Possible, since I doubt if I came back from Philadelphia)

It's Option C.

Refers to options study; my status as potential consultant; but I only wanted out. If not Extrication by RMN, then by me.

WRI Conference

Who was there

My reading: (no...earlier...)

King and Parks: his earlier reading of Gandhi; issue of absolute pacifism (Robert says that Sharp feels strongly that nonviolence will never get serious attention so long as it is associated with absolute pacifism and an essentially religious commitment, a necessity for a religious conversion, rather than being seen as instrumental, a practical alternative to violent methods).

(Robert also says that in the mid-70's there was a split between Vinoba Bhave, Gandhi's "perfect disciple," who thought social change would come only from personal conversion, and who stressed entirely the constructive program and spiritual aspects, and J.P. Narayan, who, having had a conversion from a Marxist commitment--he had opposed Gandhi as a Socialist and had been imprisoned, and escaped, for sabotage during the war--believed in organized, nonviolent resistance). Janaki speaks of a controversy in the '60's about "passive" nonviolence versus 'militant' (confrontational?)

(Deming, as I recall, impressed me with the power of noncollaboration: in the spirit of Etienne de la Boetie...)

Point of King (find): Niebuhr worries;

Bob Eaton: night before sentencing, beer party, politics.

"I'm an organizer;" (Where is he now?)

Vigil: should I go? Not since April 27, 1965... (No: November 1967! No others?)

I join hands; stand in line; pass out handbills.

(Like: Letter to the new York Times; vs. classified letter to CINCSAC.)

speakers for Eaton

Discussion with Bill Sutherland and George Willoughby at lunch; right of English to defend themselves; and "NV wouldn't have saved the Jews."

But nothing saved the jews; violence did not save any jews; they almost all died (and violence saved none).

Nor did anyone try to save the Jews, or do what they could. Not even violence to the ovens at Auschwitz.

Nor trading trucks or medicines (nonviolence!)

Nor expanding quotas (nonviolence!)

Threat of punishment did not work.

I recall Hilberg: wartime conditions were critical. Could it be that self-defense/war was at the expense of the Jews?

What would Niemoller say? Janaki sends me off with Niemoller. Niemoller quote. His "TN pacifism; Heisenberg; about 1950.

Niemoller: yes, of course. (In effect, Jews were hostage; see Hitler quote; and rather than pride ourselves on risking our own lives to save the hostages, we attacked the kidnappers at the clear expense of the hostages' lives!

This undermined my confidence in my rejection of pacifism, justification of violence: if it could be this ill-reasoned...appeared ideological...

(The justification of the Russians and British remains; or the French and Czechs, though they did not fight to the death! (They did sacrifice their Jews) (Were British fighting to save their Jews? A reason, but not their reason). (Could also be argued: if no fighting, no extermination of the Jews: especially if immigration had been accepted elsewhere: another nonviolent alternative). (above all, if the Jews had used NV tactics, visible: both in Germany and elsewhere! See pressure on SU, for example; (suppose there had been a Cold War with Germany!

Debate: van Lierde and Burt Wallrich: could pacifists collaborate with violent revolutionaries? Could they remain in a revolutionary alliance if it began to use violent tactics?